

## REMARKS

Claims 14-17 were previously pending in the application, all of which stand rejected. In the present response, Claims 14-17 are amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0093521 to Daly et al. (“Daly”).

Claim 14 is patentable over Daly because it recites that the “subpixel repeating group [of the second colored subpixel layout] further comprises at least one column having more than one color.” FIG. 4 of the Application and paragraph [0033] provides support for this limitation, stating that “... the systems and techniques ... disclosed herein work as well on any panel having displays in which a given column ... has more than one color assignments.”

In contrast, Daly converts high-resolution image to a lower-resolution image by splitting a high-resolution OCD image into separate luminance channel and chrominance channel and sub-pixel sampling the luminance channel to create an additive color domain luminance image (ACD). However, it is unclear that Daly’s repeating group can have different colors in a column. Daly discloses that before sampling is done, the chrominance and luminance channels are converted back to the RGB domain by simply copying the layer of channels into three identical R, G, and B layers (Daly, [0069]). According to the sampling described in Daly’s Background section, the resulting “second colored subpixel layout” has a column of R, a column of G, and a column of B repeating. There is no

indication that the “second colored subpixel layout” can have a column with more than one color.

For at least this reason, Claim 14 is patentable over Daly. Claims 15 and 16 depend from Claim 14 and are thus patentable over Daly for the same reason.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Daly in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0052886 to Naegle (“Naegle”). Claim 17 depends from Claim 14, which is patentable over Daly because it recites that “said subpixel repeating group further comprises at least one column having more than one color.” Naegle also fails to this limitation, and thus fails to cure the deficiency in Daly. Hence, Claim 17 is patentable over a combination of Daly and Naegle.

### Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Authorization is given to charge any fees due or credit any overpayments in regard to this communication to deposit account 50-5029. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (408) 331-1672 is welcomed and encouraged.

#### Certification of Electronic Transmission

Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's EFS-Web electronic system on:

June 2, 2010

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Kieun "Jenny" Sung

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/

Respectfully submitted,

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/

Kieun "Jenny" Sung  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,639

#### **Innovation Counsel LLP**

21771 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 200  
Cupertino, California 95014  
Direct: (408) 331-1672  
Telephone: (408) 331-1670  
Facsimile: (408) 725-8263  
E-mail: [jsung@innovationcounsel.com](mailto:jsung@innovationcounsel.com)